## <u>REMARKS</u>

In response to the Office Action mailed, November 1, 2006, the Applicant has carefully considered this Action and the Examiner's position.

In this regard, Applicant has amended Claim 1 in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action. In particular, the Applicant has amended Claim 1 to eliminate the reference to the circular apertures and has added the limitation that the arcuate rebates are facing away from and toward the back plate.

Since the Examiner has indicated that Claim 1 would be allowable as now amended, Applicant believes that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-5 depend on Claim 1 and add novel combinations thereto. For this reason, as well as the reasons discussed above, Applicant believes that Claims 2-5 are also in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant has noted that the Examiner has found Claim 6 to be allowable. Based upon the foregoing Amendment, Applicant believes that Claims 1-6 are all in condition for allowance, and an early notice of allowability is earnestly solicited.

If any questions remain which may be resolved by a telephone interview,
.
Applicant's undersigned Attorney would gladly discuss such issues with the Examiner at

the Examiner's convenience. For this purpose, Applicant's undersigned Attorney has provided his telephone number below.

Respectfully, submitted

Melvin I. Stoltz/

Registration No. 25,934 Attorney for Applicant

MIS:rpr (203) 874-8183